

Mayoral Response to Councilor Allis & Mass Proposed Cuts to the 2018 Operating Budget

Legislative: No Change from Mayor's Proposed Budget.

Executive: **Reduction in Executive Administration Salary and Wages by \$40,000 from \$116,903 to \$76,903.** Rationale: These are positions that did not previously exist but were repurposed from other departments as there was not adequate work in those Departments. \$40,000 represents the cost of a single Fire Fighter. We prefer to see progress towards long time fire department staffing goals before expanding the office of the Mayor. Councilors Note that the position for Economic Development & Marketing is \$40,000 and is unfilled by a person dedicated fulltime to that purpose and a transfer into that position would avoid any layoff or unemployment costs and still keep the Mayor's preferred team in place.

This Reduces Total Executive Administration to \$77,103.

This reduces total executive from \$318,249 to \$278,249.

Mayor response:

How unfortunate it is that our elected officials depreciate the work load, accomplishments and work ethic of these positions and departments with such demeaning language. An apology is in order to the employees. To suppose, from their disadvantaged point, that the employees did not have "adequate work" to stay in those departments is typical of the continued employee degradation voiced from these Councilors and contrary to the Civility Resolution just passed by the Council. In fact, their tasks and responsibilities of the employees have increased.

The transfer of salary from Energy replaced a second position in the Mayor's office that was not filled and more accurately described the responsibilities of the transferred position as Assist to the Mayor. This assistance requires the position to tend to needs of other departments at various times during the year. For instance, maintaining a bridge to the budgets of all departments via MUNIS, preparing the annual budget, supervising and educating employees of compliance with laws and regulations, resolving citizen and interdepartmental issues, overseeing special projects, and regular day-to-day office operations.

After the retirement of the Finance Director last fiscal year, the Finance and Administration duties were separated by a stipend payment to the City Auditor and the

salary contribution of several departments for Administrative duties was consolidated into the Executive for a more clear reflection of authority, process and organization. This Executive Administrator negotiates all collective bargaining negotiations, coordinates employee grievances, monitors and communicates for Capital projects, ensures compliance with official actions, meets with department leaders at their convenience, coordinates board, authority and commission issues, many other tasks inherent to delivering services & programs, represents the city at various functions and committees and may include responsibilities of a recently passed Council Ordinance to schedule Precinct meetings.

The Councilors inaccurately report that \$40,000 is the cost of a fire fighter. This estimate does NOT represent the cost of a firefighter for wages, academy, training, equipment, insurance and miscellaneous benefits. To suggest and “prefer progress”, as indicated by these Councilors for Fire department staffing before “expanding” the Mayor’s office exemplifies the lack of departmental knowledge, Mayoral duties and city priorities. I’ll defend the Mayor in this critique by simply saying that the Mayor is ultimately responsible and accountable for all city actions, both physical and fiscal, and ample staff is critically required to adhere to that responsibility. On the fire department staffing matter specifically, the city of Greenfield has an extremely low probability to reach the National Fire Standards proposed by a decades old study and promoted by a certain fire fighter. Internal discussions have indicated so. The current staffing issue is a direct result of municipal employees on leave for various issues and incidents and is short term.

The \$40,000 alluded to in Economic Development & Marketing as an avenue to keep the “Mayor’s preferred team in place” fails to realistically understand the caliber of the position and the needs of the criteria of the team. \$40,000 is not in the ballpark to attract a qualified individual required of the position. Our frugal strategy is to provide existing employee strengths and skills for city economic development actions by providing partial compensation for assistance from other departments.

Final analysis of MALis report and impact: 1 lay-off, One 100% grant funded new employee not hired, aborted plan for resolution of staff shortage and lack of funding, ripple expense to other line items, less oversight, delayed responses, unprofessional city office, less coordination, decreased grant potential, decreased service and less opportunity for developing city presence at various State and Federal levels.

Financial Administration: Reduction in Assessors Salary and wages by \$6,000 from \$102,400 to \$96,400. Rationale: The retirement July 1 of the Chief Assessor who was a long time town employee should result in savings as a new Chief Assessor is hired at a lower rate.

This reduces Total Assessors to \$156,971.

This reduces total Financial Administration from \$900,547 to \$894,547.

Mayor response:

A Request For Proposals (RFP) for city assessment services has been advertised with one (1) respondent. That respondent has been declared qualified and is currently under review for contract. The Chief Assessor retirement had been anticipated. Our research has indicated that many communities have contracted professional real and personal property assessment services (such as our RFP) for timely and guaranteed filings and defensible evaluations. These communities have reported satisfaction with the professional services. For our city, as evidenced by a failure to reconcile our evaluations currently, this RFP is particularly relevant for the city to have the skilled competencies for compliance with Department of Revenue processes and technological knowledge of city software for proper and timely application that will guarantee compliance, fair and equal evaluations and compatible financial procedures for city business. This is the primary purpose of the RFP.

A Chief Assessor will be appointed as dictated by Charter Section 6-14. We are required to assess property by law and by an annual review of specific properties. All procedures have been initiated for this action and discussions are ongoing with interested parties.

Final analysis of MALis report and impact: Any proposed budget reduction in this department may cause a financial review and search for qualified services comparable to bidder, delayed assessments (current contract expires June 30, 2018), continued property owner discontent, lack of continuity for city representation in Tax Appellate Court matters and disrupt planned employee expansion of duties.

Operations Support: Reduction in Greenfield Technology Department Salary and Wages by \$22,476 from \$200,000 to \$177,524. Rationale: The Mayor provided no adequate rationale for the increase in this department by 16%. Councilors Note that this department has been distracted by providing transitional assistance to GCET and now that GCET has submitted their own operating budget, there is no reason to believe that that assistance will continue to be needed. Additionally, Taxpayers should not be subsidizing ratepayers. All costs of GCET should be adequately reflected in the Enterprise Fund. This reduction still allows for a 3% increase in Department Salary and Wages.

This reduces total Greenfield Technology Department to \$404,874.

This reduces Total Operations Support from \$772,053 to \$749,577.

Mayor response with information submitted by GTD Department Leader:

What is especially important to note are the inaccuracies and false assumptions portrayed by the two Councilors. Again, the lack of knowledge for internal operations

coupled with erroneous assumptions creates false conclusions and optics. The Greenfield Technology Department (GTD) did not assist GCET but the Department leader participated with the Mayoral assigned team to review the GCET structure and to develop a plan after the General Manager contract was terminated. This participation is typical of a department leader to offer expertise in city matters. GCET, on the other hand, has decreased city expenses by approximately \$30,000 by having GTD transition to GCET internet services with additional savings expected during the next year. GTD received a grant of \$75,000 (thanks only to the department leaders knowledge and relationship with the MASS IT) to pay for a mandated upgrade of Public Safety communications.

Another false statement suggesting that tax payers (presumably by funding GTD) are funding GCET seems merely an attempt to continue to degrade the GCET mission. GTD is the IT for the city, an essential service. Tax payers do not pay for GCET.

GTD is three years old. They, primarily the department leader, has met the goals and accomplished more than expected during the rebuilding of the city network in a very difficult recruiting area. The real issue is compensation in a technology discipline that creates financial stress for a restricted budget environment. The six employee turnovers during the three year rebuild were caused by inferior compensation and resulted in turning over staff every year.

This last iteration for staff recruitment followed a HR review of job descriptions and market study to include salary data for the region, salary benchmark surveys from MMA and survey from other towns/cities. We were significantly less in comparable compensation but are now in the 25th to 50th percentile somewhat on a par with the school department but still out of the market. The budget reflects the wages as slightly competitive and as a commitment to the two employees hired.

This is a 24/7 department and besides providing the essentials for maintaining the network, without their contribution to keeping the city “up”, other departments may find their systems down. We have 24/7 departments to satisfy our commitment to our residents and GTD is there to assure a smooth and expected network. “As we move toward more technology to support city services and provide better service to residents, demands on IT increase, not decrease” states the GTD leader.

Final analysis of MALis report and impact: Reduction in hours or 1 lay off, continued difficulty in recruiting, loss of training investment, loss of grant participation with MASS IT and failure to meet city goals.

Licensing and Registration: Reduction in Greenfield City Clerk Salary and Wages by \$10,000 from \$138,393 to \$128,393. Rationale: This reduction contemplates savings when negotiating

the contract for both the new City Clerk retiring August of this year and the New Deputy City Clerk currently vacant.

This Reduces Total City Clerk to: \$132,714.

This reduces Total Licensing and Registration from \$208,124 to \$190,124.

Mayor response with information submitted by City Clerk:

A new Clerk and possibly new Assistant Clerk could result in less wages than are currently expended. The suggested reduction by the MALis report would cause the Administrative Assistant (AA) to become a part time employee. There will be several months of training for the two new employees and the AA will need to take on additional duties to assure deadlines and mandates are satisfied. "This cannot be accomplished if the office is not fully staffed."

Although the current City Clerk has a full time AA doing Council tasks, she still uses more than 50% of her time doing Council work. The balance of staff will be required to complete all Office duties. This would cause a delay in accommodating the Public request for certifications and licenses on a walk in basis resulting in loss of revenue, and later, staff stress and loss of staff.

Final analysis of MALis report and impact: Reduced employee hours, customer dissatisfaction, loss of revenue, potential loss of staff, potential increased stress and loss of staff time, errors of compliance and potential increased liability.

Land Use and Development: No Change from Mayor's Proposed Budget.

Other General Government: No Change from Mayor's Proposed Budget.

Public Safety:

Police:

Reduction in Police Salary and Wages by \$219,128 from \$3,275,556 to \$3,056,428. Rationale: This reflects a cut of \$101,000 for the Mayor's "Error" as requested together with the Salary and wages for the two proposed School Resource Officers proposed by the Mayor without the support of the School Committee.

Mayor response with information submitted by the Police Department Chief:

The "error" of \$101,000 was detected in ample time as required by law for reporting as evidenced by my multiple communications to the Council to amend and including the explanation of City Auditor of her data entry mistake at a Council sub-committee meeting and my budget letter. In addition, a legal opinion was submitted to the Council for Councilor review basically stating if it is not there it cannot be spent.

I stand fast and serious about protecting defenseless school environments. Primarily, due to our scattered site district but also for the many benefits of such an addition is for the schools. This belated adjustment for two additional School Resource Officers to the Police Department budget (after submission of the department to the Mayor) is not totally a reaction to the horrific incidents occurring in these soft zones across the Country but also to expand Officer relations to all members of our community, akin to Community Policing which is an accepted policy in the entire country.

Navigating through the early years of childhood and maturity and learning multiple techniques and mechanisms for socialization and safety requires positive role models. Parents and school Administrators have stated their desire for additional presence of such role models to enhance our district and not succumb to the less than secure school environment in other cities and towns across the country. Debating the cost or the peripheral issues, without acting on a plan, is irresponsible.

To suggest that the School Committee is not supportive or has voted negatively or has accepted or rejected this assistance is a non-starter. Clearly, any modifications to the existing MOU will be discussed with all interested parties when the Resource Officers are oriented. If the debate is just about money then let that be exposed and discussed.

The balance of the suggested reduction is approximately \$114,000. That Resource Officer cost is inclusive of salary, incentive pay, holiday pay, range pay and clothing as is typical for the Police Department budget process. If the Council rejects the Mayor's recommendation for additional security for our children, a recommendation many others see as responsible and logical, and the requested funds of \$114,000 are cut from the Police Budget then that budget cannot withstand any further reductions without impacting current staff.

Final analysis of MALis report and impact: No action to hire additional Resource Officers, inability to promote security and presence to elementary schools and coordinated coverage to the Middle school, inability to offer in house training to all school areas, minimal safety plan implemented, school security managed by untrained individuals.

Reduction in Police Expenditures by \$58,026 from \$283,347 to \$225,321. Rationale: This reflects a \$16,000 cut the two proposed School Resource Officers related training and expenses proposed by the Mayor without the support of the School Committee. This also includes a \$42,026 cut in Lease payments for three new leased vehicles. Councilors Note that in the last 5 years we have leased three new vehicles 4 out of 5 years for a total of 12 vehicles that are 5 or less years old. We have a total of 18 or 19 cruisers for only 34 officers and typically only 4 to 7 uniformed officers on any given shift. The Police Chief indicated that vehicles that would be coming offline were in fact serviceable when he indicated that his intent was to retrofit those vehicles for the two new SROs. Many other vehicles in the municipality are far older. While

these vehicles get substantial use, Councilors Allis and Mass recommend that the newest vehicles be used in the field instead of by senior management.

This reduces total police to \$3,281,749.

Mayor response with information submitted by the Police Department Chief:

The suggested reduction of \$16,000 in training funds due to the anticipated reduction of the Resource Officers reflects a lack of knowledge of pending issues. Admittedly, the Councilors may not have such internal information due to the nature of the information, however, that is why we have professional leaders preparing the budgets in their particular areas. There are planned personnel adjustments in the near future and this training line item accommodates those expected changes. There will be a critical negative impact on staff if a reduction is voted.

FACT: All vehicles are marked. In other words, contrary to the assumption that vehicles are leased for “senior management” and not placed in the field, is false. These vehicles are for Patrol Officers. The Councilors are correct in that we have instituted a vehicle leasing program over the past five years. This replacement plan resulted in a reduction from \$50,000 in vehicle repairs years ago to approximately \$12,500 today. Leasing also provides three vehicles immediately and annually rather than a one vehicle purchase annually as in the past. The city owns the vehicles at the end of the lease term. Currently, we have nine marked vehicles and if any are taken off the road (accident, malfunction) the department will need to run vehicles 24/7 with no break.

To accommodate the Resource Officers transportation need the Chief stated two vehicles could be retrofitted for that specific use. That would result in a savings by not leasing two additional vehicles primarily because they would be used to and from school sites and parked most of the day and all of the night.

The reference to the number of Officers on a shift or employed that might determine the number of vehicles is not only naïve but ridiculous. The reference to other municipal vehicles that are “older” adds to the complete misunderstanding of departmental operations. For example, the city has presented vehicle needs for savings and for needs. Most often, the funds have not been approved.

Final analysis of MAlis report and impact: Reduction in force, failure to prepare for vehicle losses, increased vehicle maintenance costs, increase in response time, potential for decreased officer safety.

Parking Enforcement: Reduction in Parking enforcement Salary and Wages by \$14,500 from \$78,421 to \$63,921. Rationale: This represents the elimination on one part time parking enforcement staff member. In the 2011 calendar year, Greenfield issues 11,299 parking tickets in 2017 calendar year we have issued 19,845 or a 57% increase. While the revenue generated is important to the Town it is offset by the cost to Commercial Property Values in the Down

Town where retail struggles to compete with Amazon, the Holyoke Mall, Turner's Falls and even Commercial Plaza's within Greenfield all of which have free parking. Overly aggressive enforcement of parking regulations is inconsistent with our Sustainable Master Plan which focuses on making the Downtown a Center for Commercial, Cultural and Social activities. The emergence of Greenfield Businesses moving out of Downtown due to parking issues or printing shirts that say Welcome to Greenfield with a parking ticket featured are indicators that the delicate pendulum of parking enforcement has swung too far. Given that the Courthouse parking scheme has settled and with the parking garage soon to come online, the proposed need for this aggressive parking enforcement no longer exists.

This reduces total parking enforcement to \$141,731

Mayor response with information submitted by the Police Department Chief:

The comparison of the number of parking tickets from 2011 to 2017 is quite a stretch. Is it relevant? I do not know but making the case for employee reductions based on the number of tickets is puzzling. I had not looked at nor had I asked the Treasurer for that data seeing it as irrelevant. What I have reviewed (several times) is the historical revenue data to assure bond payment for the parking garage.

The current supervision and policies for enforcing parking ordinances or violations has not changed. Only violators are ticketed. It may be exciting during an election year to feel admired by promoting "free" parking and fewer Parking Enforcement Officers (PEO), however, lack of order as it relates to parking will cause concern and complaints from residential and commercial property owners alike. Our enforcement is not overly aggressive or contrary to our Master Plan. The Parking and Traffic Committee meets regularly, modifies its plans and policies as valid requests are brought forward and tends to the business of traffic and safe bikeways and walkways as well.

Parking and downtown property taxes are not related. Commercial is downtown and the use of commercial property dictates value not parking. Selective examples of malls, plazas and Turners Falls as free parking centers does not consider that the "cost" is there and only billed differently. For malls and plazas, the cost is embedded in the rent and for Turners Falls it may be a lost leader to increase pedestrian traffic to their downtown. Greenfield's downtown is recognized by many as thriving, vibrant, diverse and active. We are transforming to a new downtown. One that offers entrepreneurial opportunities, mom & pop business, unique boutiques, arts and entertainment and many other amenities that provide what people need and want. The commercial space turnover rate is approximate to other sized downtowns, and in some areas, we are show finer comparables to larger downtowns.

It is more relevant to consider other regional centers similar to Greenfield, such as, Amherst, Northampton and Brattleboro for parking solutions and costs. It is beneficial to note that each community has a parking garage near downtown, metered and kiosk

parking and that the cost to park are greater than our space parking. PEO's also provide additional Ordinance compliance during their rounds.

Many studies & surveys have indicated that parking is one of the least important factors to success of commercial development. One of the current barriers to development is our building code ordinance that requires 1 space for each 300 square feet while our Master Plan promotes non-vehicular initiatives, such as, pervious parking, rain gardens, landscaping and shade. The Council might consider working in that area to have a substantial impact on development.

Final analysis of MAlis report and impact: 1 lay off, increased violations, decreased revenue.

Building Inspector: Reduction in Salary and Wages by \$45,600 from \$155,770 to \$110,170.

Rationale: This represents a reduction of one full-time building inspector a position that is currently vacant. This decision for various reasons has been contemplated for multiple years by various factions on the council for different reasons. This job was once done by a single inspector at time when Greenfield had a larger population and with greater general satisfaction in the Department. Councilors Allis and Mass note that the remaining salaries and wages in the department (including part-time clerical staff) exceed twice the reduction of the position. Councilors Allis and Mass suggest a reconsolidation of all inspections departments under a single Director and the elimination of the chief building inspectors position would allow for 1 ½ - 2 building inspectors if in fact needed.

This reduces the Total Building Inspector to \$113,937

This reduces Total Public Safety to \$6,474,651.

Mayor response (Building Commissioner is on vacation time):

The inspector position is currently vacant due to a resignation (job opportunity nearer to home) and is advertised. We see no advantage for the city to eliminate this position. The work required for current projects and code mandated inspections are consistent. There is a requirement also for the inspector to be on call for emergency inspections 24/7 for fire, catastrophic events and declared disasters. Employing only one inspector will stall scheduled daily inspections. At the moment, the inspector and administrative assistant are unable to maintain current reports and fee collections due to the resignation and elimination of a half time inspector last budget year.

In recent years, a discussion to eliminate the department only occurred when an agreement was available with the County inspection program. Certified Building Commissioners, mandated by law for all communities, have become a critical job

position due to the small reservoir of qualified candidates and cannot be eliminated as suggested by the MALis report.

We cannot return to the 1 inspector days for many reasons as suggested by the MALis report. When we did, we had the same population and less building development by any measurement. With current employee rights and negotiated leave absences, this department would be down 25% of the time and city liability would be increased with only one certified Commissioner. A Supervisor of Inspections has been considered (as apparently the MALis report has discussed with the team), is still under review, but is not feasible at this time without bargaining and budget modifications. Final online permitting software selected and expectation for use within 6 months.

Final analysis of MALis report and impact: 1 position lost, loss of revenue, increased liability, dissatisfied contractors, delayed permitting and approvals.

Education: No Reduction from Mayor's Proposed Budget. Councilor's Allis and Mass await School Committee further input and deliberations prior to any recommendations for increases.

Public Works:

Operating Budget: **Reduction from DPW Salary and Wages by \$11,461 from \$1,571,949 to \$1,560,488.** Rationale: This reduction represents anticipated savings based on the hiring of a new DPW Director. The DPW Director has repeatedly and consistently indicated his desire to leave including near daily statements within his office that he "Hopes today is the day he gets a pink slip".

Mayor response with information submitted by the DPW Director:

These two Councilors continue the personal attacks and employee degradations with this budget tactic. Let's remember comments about cutting or eliminating the Parking division several months ago. That type of bullying and intimidation and attempt to micro-manage with the purse, especially with municipal employee lives, is unprofessional, uncalled for and ugly.

Two budget years ago, a prediction of the retirement date of the Finance Director was attempted with a reduction in that department. Of course, the two Councilors were in error again, there was no retirement, and thankfully despite their insults and name calling, the budget cut was not voted.

The idea that we would hire a Director for less is based on "Anticipated savings", what does that even mean? The current Director is already paid less than his counterparts. Even the Mayor is a bargain basement deal and yet these Councilors were lost at the wheel to offer equal pay for equal work. Basically, incompetent to organize a simple Task Force to arrive at a simple recommendation.

This Director has saved the city millions of dollars by shepherding and accelerating major projects through MADOT procedures such as Nash's Mills Bridge and Wisdom Way. He also has addressed serious infrastructure deficits that others prefer to deny, bury their heads and muffle their ears.

Final analysis of MALis report and impact: Same Director, same pay. If retirement occurs, we will follow the same city procedures for any other retirement...once we are notified.

Snow and Ice Removal: Reduction in salary and wages by \$760 from \$76,000 to \$75,240. Reduction in Expenditures from by \$6,440 from \$149,000 to \$142,560. Rationale: This (along with Veterans Benefits) is one of the only line item for which we can deficit spend. If we increase our base it is an increase that will carry on. DPW will spend all that is required for snow and ice removal and additional costs can be paid by Free Cash if it exists. If no Free Cash exists DOR allows deficits to be carried into the following year. If we appropriate more than we need, it has no effect on snow and ice removal positive or negative, but increases taxes without the need to do so.

Mayor response with information submitted by the DPW Director:

Correct. The city can deficit spend. This has occurred 9 of the past 10 years. Is it smart or wise to do so? I would say that trying to be accurate in your estimated expenses is best. There is no "savings" for the tax payer. Just think it through. All expenses are from tax payers. Whether the deficit is paid from the DPW account, free cash or next years budget, the deficit is paid from tax payer revenues. When mild winters occur there is a surplus and in that case the funds are returned (\$80,000 most recently).

The Department of Revenue has restrictions on the amount that can be reduced from the Snow & Ice budget.

Final analysis of MALis report and impact: No impact. Allocate funds now for best practice and planning or pay the deficit in the next fiscal year.

This reduces Total Snow and Ice Removal to \$217,800

This Reduces Total Public Works to \$2,384,140

Other DPW Related Expenses: No Change from Mayor's Proposed Budget.

Human Services:

Health Inspection Service: Reduce Salary and Wages by \$52,920 from \$197,086 to \$144,166.

Rationale: At previous full staffing levels (multiple positions vacant) this Department was so underworked that they focused on picayune and self-serving/generated complaints including but not limited to bringing court action related to the length of grass of one of the inspectors immediate neighbors. This Department at one time with a population that was greater than

current was serviced by 1-2 inspectors. Councilors Allis and Mass did not propose further cuts to this Department so as to allow the Mayor the flexibility to consolidate all inspections Departments under a single Director of Inspections to be paid for by the unfilled Chief Health Inspector Position.

Mayor response with information submitted by the Nurse Leader:

Fraudulent analysis and despicable comments from elected officials. I apologize for them to the Health Inspections Department and our Public Nurse. This is another example of a lack of knowledge of the actual workload, responsibilities and tasks required by law and regulation. It is dangerous to have such misinformation for the uninformed Councilors that are required to properly fund the laws.

In the year 2016, this department produced 1,442 inspections. In the year 2017, this department produced 1,495 inspections. All inspections were prompted by regulation and law, not discretion. With a staff of 1 director, 1 full time inspector, 1 part-time inspector, 1 part-time health nurse and 1 part-time administrative assistant, the 3 inspectors average 5.75 inspections per day. That is IF they have no holidays, no vacation, no sick days, no bereavement days, no personal days, which of course, cannot happen.

The department, via the Board of Health, has special autonomy through the Massachusetts General Laws. The inspections spectrum includes but is not limited to, housing, food, animals, septic, pools, camps, quarantines, ordinances, laws, disease and rabies exposure.

Reduction of such an amount will make the department inoperable and non-compliant with DPH regulations. The consolidation idea is ours and part of internal discussions. It puzzles me, somewhat, to have this suggested budget reduction and then state that a further cut is postponed "to allow the Mayor the flexibility to consolidate the inspections department under a single director" when that plan has been only superficially studied.

Final analysis of MAlis report and impact: Another attempt to micro-manage with the purse will cause a bargaining grievances, another attempt to punish a department that did not acquiesce to Councilor's bidding, disable the mission of the Department and BOH, 2 layoffs, 1 reduction of hours, non-compliance with mandated inspections, render Health department inoperable.

Youth Commission: **Reduction from \$2,000 to \$0.** Rationale: This Commission which Councilors Allis and Mass fully support was appropriated \$5,000 two years ago. Last year that was folded into the Recreation Department Budget moving the Department (which was once at a large population run with 1 full-time employee) to 3 full time employees (triggering additional health insurance of other benefit related costs from operating rather than revolving fund).

These funds already exist within the Recreation Department and the Recreation Department should be instructed to support the Youth Commission or alternatively there should be a corresponding cut to Recreation. Further these funds were not requested.

Mayor response with information submitted by the Recreation Director:

At the request of the former Chair of the Youth Commission and Precinct Councilor Maria Burge, a small allocation was requested to further expand the Commissions influence with the community youth.

The Recreation Department appreciates the continued support of the City Council. As mentioned in Councilor Allis and Mass's Operating Budget Proposal, in FY17 the Recreation Department absorbed the \$5,000 Youth Commission funding to offer pre-teen and teen programming as both the Recreation Commission and Youth Commission felt there was a void in services. The Recreation Department has provided Teen Open-Mic Nights, Pre-Teen Art Programs, Outdoor Exploration Program, and continues to support the Middle School Cycle Kids Program, etc. The Recreation Department would be happy to work with the Youth Commission in support of their mission.

However, your comments regarding the growth of the Recreation Department were without merit. Having worked for the City for the past 11 years, this department has worked tirelessly to write and secure multiple grants, rejuvenate nearly all of the parks and playgrounds (with a few yet to go), and develop comprehensive year-round programming and special events for people of all ages. We strive to market Greenfield as a great place to live, work, and play! The Recreation Department is more than just your "Fun Patrol" – it's coordination of construction projects, hiring, training and supervising nearly 50 seasonal staff, managing and coordinating park use, and so much more. The notion that one full-time staff member can coordinate and oversee all of this is unrealistic.

This reduces the Total Human Services to \$841,354.

Culture and Recreation: No Change from Mayor's Proposed Budget. (See Youth Commission above).

Debt Service: No Change from Mayor's Proposed Budget.

Miscellaneous: No Change from Mayor's Proposed Budget.

This reduces Total Operating Budget by 1.01% a Total of \$489,311 from \$48,810,304 to \$48,320,993.